



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,126	10/25/2001	Kai Tuschner	MWS-042RCE	1888
959 7590 07/26/2007 LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON, MA 02109-2127			EXAMINER BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/057,126

Applicant(s)

TUSCHNER ET AL.

Examiner

Adam L. Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed 04/23/07.
2. All previous rejections to the claims are maintained.
3. Claims 1-35 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 10, 19, 23, 27 and 31 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 9-14, 18-29, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell et al. (U.S. Patent 6269475; date of patent July 31, 2001; filed June 2, 1998) in view of Aptus et al. (U.S. Patent 7114149; date of patent September 26, 2006; filed April 20, 2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, Farrell discloses generating source code from a block diagram model (column 2, lines 27-45: "generating source code...with respect to an object model...also associates code such code with the chosen class"; column 4, lines 66-67; column 5, lines 1-3, 16-17, and 50-64; column 6, lines 24-33).

Farrell further discloses pointer links that associate the elements of the generated source code with an element of the block diagram model and vice versa (column 5, lines 50-63). Farrell does not specifically disclose wherein the pointer links were hypertext link in a listing of the generated source code. Aptus teaches hypertext links pointing between a text and diagram representation of source code (column 2, lines 5-8 and 14-19; column 3, lines 23-39; column 5, lines 45-56; column 23, lines 52-48; column 26, lines 46-48: "links between diagram portion and the text portion are hypertext...links"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the pointer links of Farrell between the object model and the generated source code to have been hypertext links as shown in Aptus, because Aptus teaches that hypertext linking was notoriously well known in the art (column 23, lines 52-58) and that said linking would provide the benefits of quick navigation through and viewing of the documentation (column 3, lines 33-36; Abstract).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Farrell discloses displaying the source code and pointers on a display and displaying to the user at least a portion of the block diagram model including an element of the model associated with the pointer (Fig. 5, 17; col. 7, lines 30-49; col. 10, lines 7-14) but does not disclose displaying the hypertext link. Aptus teaches displaying hypertext links pointing between a text portion and a diagram portion in documentation of source code (col. 26, lines 49-67; col. 27, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Farrell and Aptus before him at the time the invention was made, to modify a pointer between code and a model as taught by Farrell to include hypertext links between code and a diagram as taught by Aptus, because Farrell teaches pointers between code

Art Unit: 2178

and a model (col. 5, lines 50-55) and Aptus teaches hypertext links used as pointers between text representing source code and a diagram (col. 26, lines 49-67; col. 27, lines 1-7).

Farrell further discloses receiving input from a user representing a selection of a pointer in the source code (Fig. 5; col. 7, lines 30-49) but does not disclose selecting the hypertext link. Aptus teaches hypertext links between a text portion and a diagram portion in documentation of source code (col. 26, lines 49-67; col. 27, lines 1-7) which could be selected. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Farrell and Aptus before him at the time the invention was made, to modify a pointer between code and a model as taught by Farrell to include hypertext links between code and a diagram as taught by Aptus, because Farrell teaches pointers between code and a model (col. 5, lines 50-55) and Aptus teaches hypertext links used as pointers between text representing source code and a diagram (col. 26, lines 49-67; col. 27, lines 1-7).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Farrell discloses displaying the associated element in a highlighted fashion (Fig. 17; col. 10, lines 7-14) since Farrell teaches displaying highlighted elements.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Farrell discloses the associated element in the generated source code is a commented reference to a block in the block diagram model (Fig. 17) since Farrell teaches commented references in the source code.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding dependent claim 5, Farrell discloses the associated element in the generated source code is a variable reference in an operative code section (Fig. 6, 7; col. 7, lines 50-67; col. 8, lines 1-5) since Farrell teaches variable references in the source code in operative sections, such as the OtherClass variable.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Farrell discloses the commented reference to a block comprises a character string identifying a path to a file providing information relating to a section of the block (Fig. 17) since Farrell teaches paths to files and classes in the source code.

Regarding independent claims 10, 19 and 23, the claims reflect the system, computer program and processor and memory for performing the operations of claim 1 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 11, 12, 13, 14 and 18, the claims reflect the system for performing the operations of claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 20, 21 and 22, Farrell discloses the computer readable medium is RAM, ROM or hard disk drive (Fig. 20; col. 11, lines 4-8, 30-36).

Regarding dependent claims 24, 25 and 26, Farrell discloses the processor and memory are incorporated into a personal computer, a network server residing in the Internet or a single board computer (Fig. 20; col. 10, lines 57-63; col. 11, lines 50-56).

Regarding independent claim 27, Farrell discloses providing source code identifying an element of a block diagram graphical model (column 2, lines 27-45: “generating source code...with respect to an object model...also associates code such code with the chosen class”; column 4, lines 66-67; column 5, lines 1-3, 16-17, and 46-64; column 6, lines 24-33); generating a document comprising information about the source code (column 2, lines 27-45: “generating source code...with respect to an object model...also associates code such code with the chosen class”; column 4, lines 66-67; column 5, lines 1-3, 16-17, 32-36 and 46-64; column 6, lines 24-33).

Farrell further discloses pointer links that associate the elements of the generated source code with an element of the block diagram model and vice versa (column 5, lines 50-63). Farrell does not specifically disclose wherein the pointer links were hypertext link in a listing of the generated source code. Aptus teaches hypertext links pointing between a text and diagram representation of source code (column 2, lines 5-8 and 14-19; column 3, lines 23-39; column 5, lines 45-56; column 23, lines 52-48; column 26, lines 46-48: “links between diagram portion and the text portion are hypertext...links”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the pointer links of Farrell between the object model and the generated source code to have been hypertext links as shown in Aptus, because Aptus teaches that hypertext linking was notoriously well known in the art (column 23, lines 52-58) and that

Art Unit: 2178

said linking would provide the benefits of quick navigation through and viewing of the documentation (column 3, lines 33-36; Abstract).

Regarding dependent claims 28 and 29, the claims reflect the method for performing the operations of claims 2, 4 and 9 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claims 31, 32, 33 and 34, the claims reflect the method for performing the operations of claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

6. Claims 6-8, 15-17 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of Aptus in further view of Yang (U.S. Pub. No. 20020055891; publication date May 9, 2002; filed August 13, 2001).

Regarding dependent claims 6, 7 and 8, Farrell does not disclose the hypertext link is Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML), Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) or Extensible Markup Language (XML). Yang teaches SGML, HTML and XML including hypertext links (p.8, para. 128). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Farrell and Yang before him at the time the invention was made, to modify links taught by Farrell to include SGML, HTML and XML as taught by Yang, because SGML, HTML and XML are constructed in a form including links, as taught by Yang (p.8, para. 128).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding dependent claims 15, 16, 17 and 30, the claims reflect the system and method for performing the operations of claims 6, 7 and 8 and are rejected along the same rationale.

7. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of Aptus in further view of Fischer (U.S. Pub. No. 20020099852; publication date July 25, 2002; filed January 2, 2002; provisional application filed January 3, 2001).

Regarding dependent claim 35, Farrell does not disclose replacing an element in the source code listing with the hypertext link. Fischer teaches replacing code with a hypertext link (p.4, para. 46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Farrell and Fischer before him at the time the invention was made, to modify a pointer between code and a model as taught by Farrell to include replacing code with hypertext links as taught by Fischer, because Farrell teaches pointers used between code and a model (col. 5, lines 50-55) and Fischer teaches replacing code with a hypertext links acting as pointers (p.4, para. 46).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 04/23/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to independent claim 1, Applicant argues that neither Farrell nor Aptus teach, "providing a hypertext link in a listing of the generated source code to associate an element of the generated source code with an element of the block diagram model." The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Farrell clearly teaches two methods of creating source

Art Unit: 2178

code from an object model. First, Farrell teaches generating source code in a programming language with respect to the object model and associating such generated code with the chosen object model class (column 2, lines 27-45: “generating source code.....associates such code”). Secondly, Farrell teaches creating codeblocks (i.e. source code) from the object model (column 5, lines 50-51: “codeblock is formed from object model”). Farrell teaches the codeblocks are an instance of a syntactic element of any given source code, wherein any given source code was therefore a tree of codeblocks. Farrell finally teaches wherein the source code, object model, and codeblocks all contained linked pointers to each other (column 5, lines 51-63).

With regard to the Aptus reference, Aptus clearly teaches inserting hypertext links pointing between a text and diagram representation of source code (column 2, lines 5-8 and 14-19; column 3, lines 23-39; column 5, lines 45-56; column 23, lines 52-48; column 26, lines 46-48: “links between diagram portion and the text portion are hypertext...links”). The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant that the hypertext links in the Aptus reference are not provided in a listing of the generated source code. Wherein Aptus teaches generating both diagram portions and textual portions of the documentation, Aptus also specifically teaches wherein the textual portions of the code could indeed be source code (column 5, lines 54-56: “the textual view of the source code may be obtained directly from the source code file”).

The arguments addressed above are substantially similar to the arguments presented for the remaining independent claims and corresponding dependent claims.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ALB


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER